

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Claims 1-21 are rejected.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct an antecedent basis problem.

I.     REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under *35 U.S.C. § 112*, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Applicant has amended Claim 1 adding "physical layer" before the first and second occurrence of "devices" to correct the antecedent basis problem. Therefore the rejection of Claim 1 under *35 U.S.C. § 112* second paragraph is traversed by the amendment to Claim 1.

The Applicants respectfully assert that the amendment to Claim 1 and incorporated by reference in any claims depending therefrom, are not narrowing amendments made for a reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent that will give rise to prosecution history estoppel. *See Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 122 S. Ct. 1831, 1839-40, 62 U.S.P.Q.2d 1705, 1711-12 (2002); 234 F.3d 555, 566, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1865, 1870 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

II.    REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected Claims 6, 9, 10, 13-14, and 19 under *35 U.S.C. §102(b)* as being anticipated by *Cassing* (C6x solutions for voice over IP gateway, Northcon/98 Conference Proceedings 21-23 Oct. 1998, pages 74-85, (hereafter "*Cassing*").

For a reference to anticipate a claimed invention, the reference must disclose every aspect of the claimed invention. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention